

# FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

*An interpretation of current international events  
by the Research Staff of the Foreign Policy Association*



Univ. of the South  
The Library  
Sewanee, Tenn.

LS-1

Property of the Library  
of the  
University of the South  
1948

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION • INCORPORATED • 22 EAST 38TH STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXVII NO. 34

JUNE 4, 1948

## Long Period Of Peacemaking Confronts U.S.

The world-wide flurry precipitated by the series of American-Russian exchanges during the past month has been overshadowed by the bloody events in Palestine, suspended at least temporarily as a result of the four-week truce agreed to by Jews and Arabs on June 1; by Czechoslovakia's single-slate Communist-controlled national elections of May 30; and by the electoral victory in South Africa of groups committed to a policy of extreme nationalism and racial discrimination. Yet these developments, however inadvertently, have brought out certain points that directly affect future relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. First, Anglo-American friction over Palestine has made it clear that divergences on important issues can develop in this country and in Britain with nations other than Russia. Second, the Palestine experience has revealed that "the boycott, the by-pass and the backdown" which, according to UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie have weakened the international organization and have been attributed to Russia and the United States, are not the only methods used by great powers to prevent fulfillment of UN recommendations. And, third, the Western nations, deeply disturbed by the character of elections in Czechoslovakia, have also seen in the South African elections a triumph of the dark forces of racism that were thought to have been weakened by the defeat of German nazism.

### No Easy Panaceas

No American making today what the French call a *tour d'horizon* can find much comfort in the new categories of anxieties created by recent developments

in the non-Soviet world. But these developments may at least help us to understand that the world situation is far more complex than would appear from mere confrontation of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and that no easy panaceas are in the offing for the world's ailments. In his address of May 28 to the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Portland, Oregon, Secretary of State Marshall warned against uncritical acceptance by the American public of Russia's peace feelers which he described as "a deliberate, a cynical propaganda campaign to offset a sincere effort on our part to establish a basis for profitable negotiations and agreements leading to a stabilization of the world situation." He also declared that "we cannot afford to pursue any line of action, however successful it might be for the time being, which would reflect on the integrity of our purpose or actions in the future." At the same time, he again emphasized, as he had done in his historic Harvard address of June 5, 1947, the long-term factors affecting the course of world events. "It is very important to realize," he said, "that the world today is in a ferment of profound unrest." This great surge of feeling, "which is a groundswell now," may "become a tidal wave later, unless it is met by some definite hope of improvement through the action of the governments concerned and through the rehabilitation of the economy of the world, which is the purpose of our present programs. Meanwhile, this unrest presents a fertile field for those who advocate violence as a corrective measure, or action for ulterior purposes." Much more patience and persistence than we

have hitherto displayed, he counseled, are "required in dealing with great international situations."

### Learning to Take a Long View

This lesson in patience is perhaps the most urgent and yet the most difficult one to learn. A wide range of questions are today in controversy all around the globe between the United States and the U.S.S.R., from Germany and Iran to Korea, from Greece and Austria to Japan. In the opinion of the Department of State, as submitted in a statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 29, the difficulties in all instances are due to the Soviet government's repeated violations of war and postwar agreements, and to its intransigence. This view is shared by a number of American commentators. Other observers, in the United States and in Europe, while firmly agreeing with the American government on the impossibility of subscribing to the Russian concept and practice of political dictatorship and criticizing the extension of Russia's influence since the war, have taken the view that the situation cannot be seen entirely in terms of black and white, of vice and virtue. They have consequently urged restudy of some of the concrete problems at issue instead of continuing the prevailing pattern of mutual recriminations and self-justifications. Little hope is held out for a quick and universal settlement. But this, in the view of the less pessimistic students of Russo-American affairs, would not preclude patient and persistent scrutiny of given problems—a view perhaps shared to some extent by Washington, since Secretary Marshall has proposed that a four-

*Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association*

power conference on free navigation of the Danube be held in Belgrade on July 30.

Although impending elections here make far-reaching decisions before November impracticable, the general atmosphere is not wholly unfavorable. The United States has so far disappointed the Kremlin's expectations of a major depression, and the consequent demise of the American economic system. On the contrary, there is growing awareness here both of the need for internal economic stabilization, and of our responsibility as a nation for improvement of material welfare in less developed countries. Russia, for its part, has not yet undergone the internal collapse on which some of the advocates of the "containment" policy had predicated their course. It has indicated a tendency to satisfy the growing needs of its population through expanded imports of goods from neighboring countries, notably Poland and Czechoslovakia—imports which, in turn, are expected to stimulate the need of these nations for trade with the West. Far apart as the political ideologies of West and East are bound to remain for a long time to come, a meeting

of interests, if not actually of minds, on economic questions is not excluded. The often repeated argument that East-West trade would strengthen the war potential of Russia and its neighbors has been answered in a letter to the *New York Times* of June 1 by a group of American economists and civic leaders who contend that current Russo-American trade also aids the war potential of the United States, since our principal imports from Russia consist of strategic materials like manganese and chrome.

Another argument frequently heard is that trade with Russia and its neighbors today may prove as dangerous for the United States as exports of scrap iron proved to be in the case of Japan. It should be borne in mind, however, that before 1939-41 the Western powers had done little or nothing to prevent the outbreak of war by peaceful means. By contrast, the United States, through the ERP, through its armament plans, and through its new determination to strengthen the UN, is developing a program which might be described as a program of "preventive peace"—in the sense that the phrase

"preventive medicine" is used to describe efforts to avert the outbreak of disease by timely remedial measures. This program differs both from the "do-nothing" policy of the Western nations on the eve of 1939, and from "preventive war," a term that is obviously misleading, since "preventive war" is usually urged not to "prevent" war, but to prevent anticipated attack from a potential enemy nation by attacking it first.

But before any negotiations are undertaken, it is generally agreed that the United States must define its long-term foreign policy objectives as clearly as possible—and, once they have been defined, adhere to them with as great a degree of consistency as it can command. Clarity, consistency, and willingness to implement officially proclaimed decisions may prove the most valuable weapons of the United States in waging what is still hoped will be a "preventive peace."

VERA MICHELES DEAN

(The last of three articles on new trends in American foreign policy.)

## ***Will Smuts' Defeat Weaken Commonwealth Ties?***

The May 26 election in the Union of South Africa brought a narrow defeat to the United party and to its leader, former Prime Minister Jan Christiaan Smuts. The 78-year-old world statesman, who lost his own seat in Parliament in a surprising personal upset, will immediately seek reelection, however, in another constituency whose incumbent will resign. The Nationalist party, which will form a new government under the premiership of Dr. Daniel F. Malan, fought the bitter election in alliance with the Afrikaner party. Together they have won a majority in the House of Assembly of only eight votes over the United party and its ally, the Labor party. But the government's working majority will be reduced to seven since the Nationalist and Afrikaner parties must elect a speaker of the House from their membership.

### ***Two South Africas***

The campaign that has just ended surpassed the usual turbulent political contest in South Africa, largely because it was fought quite openly on the explosive race question. The Nationalists chose the race issue as a whip over Smuts and the United party, adopting the most vituperative language in assailing the former gov-

ernment's handling of non-European or native affairs. Fearing that white supremacy would ultimately be doomed by Smuts' policy of "parallel" development for non-Europeans, Malan and his adherents proposed a vaguely defined system called "Apartheid," which would mean strict partition for white and colored races in the Union. At present the color bar and other discriminatory legislation effectively divide Europeans and non-Europeans, while segregation is practiced in almost every area of public and private life. Non-Europeans, however, now live on farms and in separate communities near most cities.

Reserves are also set aside for Africans, and it is apparently the Nationalist plan that these reserves should be expanded so as to provide territory for natives wholly removed from areas populated by Europeans. It is as yet too early to predict exactly how the Nationalists will implement their policy on the crucial race question. They have indicated that no immediate step will be taken to "partition" South Africa; and in time this most drastic form of "Apartheid" may, in fact, be entirely dropped because of its utter impracticability. United party members

pointed out in the campaign that non-European labor on the farms, in cities, and above all in the mines is a prerequisite of South Africa's continued economic prosperity. Gold mining, the nation's chief industry, rests on native labor, as to a lesser extent does the growing light industry of the Union. Such labor is needed on the spot and, since partition would mean virtual national bankruptcy, the Nationalists will doubtless be deterred from carrying out "Apartheid" in its extremist form.

As long as the Nationalists remain in power, however, two South Africas—the nearly two and a half million European whites and the more than nine million non-Europeans—will face each other across an ever widening gap. Not only is the official Nationalist policy reactionary in the extreme, but other groups in alliance with the Malanites are known to be racist in outlook and hold views similar to those of the Nazi party in Hitler's Germany. The Afrikaner party, mentioned above, is less extreme than Dr. Malan's party, but the New Order movement led by Oswald Pirow, prewar Minister of Defense, and J. F. van Rensburg's Ossewa Brandwag, which is organized along the

lines of Hitler's storm troopers, are both totalitarian in aim.

### **Foreign Policy Repercussions**

All the Nationalist parties, moreover, are strongly isolationist. They have resented the mild and as yet ineffective action which was taken by the UN on the two issues it has dealt with in relation to the former Smuts government—Southwest Africa and the status of Indians in the Union. Most observers, in fact, agree that the pressure thus exerted from the world outside with respect to these two racial problems swayed numerous voters against the United party. It is a measure of the complexity of South Africa's political situation that Smuts should be attacked abroad for his illiberal racial policy and yet be dropped from office at home because his program of gradual development for non-Europeans was considered too progressive.

The wider repercussions of the Union's elections will be apparent when the UN again tackles the problem of Southwest Africa or the Indian question. In other ways also the Nationalist victory may mark a new departure in the Dominion's foreign affairs. For the perennial issue of South Africa's relation to the British Commonwealth was also at stake in the election. This issue was not especially stressed before the voting, but Nationalists, under other party labels, have long favored independence from the Commonwealth and the establishment of a Republic.

The oldest political division in the Dominion—the rift between Britisher and Boer—is involved in the Union's position in the Commonwealth structure. Smuts, who is an Afrikaner of Dutch descent and whose career began in opposition to Britain in the Boer war, symbolizes the extent to which the tension between the two

major groups of white South Africans has been relaxed. Only recently, on May 23, he urged the necessity for tighter links among the British nations, adding that the Commonwealth and the United States should also be bound more closely together.

Afrikaners of extreme nationalist views, however, will now have a stronger voice in Dominion policy abroad, and may raise the issue of breaking the Commonwealth tie completely. At least, they can be expected to shun closer relations with London and with the other Dominions. Thus from an immediate practical point of view the Nationalist victory will probably affect London's plans for joint defense with South Africa, and may also limit the recently growing interest of both British and American investors in further economic development of the Union.

GRANT S. MCCLELLAN

## **Statehood For Alaska Urged On Strategic Grounds**

WASHINGTON—Statehood for Alaska, if adopted, may mark a significant change in American policy. On May 21 President Truman asked Congress in a special message to grant statehood immediately to Alaska, a strategic territory, in keeping with the opinion which Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug had expressed on April 16, 1947 to the House Committee on Public Lands that Alaska can be satisfactorily defended in war only if it is thickly populated, and that it will remain thinly populated unless it becomes a state. Heretofore both Army and Navy authorities, who have frequently been given the task of administering colonial territories, have discouraged any introduction of self-government into dependencies that possess strategic value. The Congress of Guam, a discussion group without power to act, protested in December 1946 to James V. Forrestal, then Secretary of the Navy, that the naval officers responsible for the administration of that island ran it "as though it were a large battleship." American Samoa since 1899 has been a benevolent dictatorship of the Navy. Now, however, military officials, under the encouragement of the Interior Department,

are modifying this traditional attitude.

### **Military Importance of Alaska**

Since the end of World War II the Army, Navy and Air Force have treated Alaska as the strategic center for the defense of the United States against attack in the Arctic and sub-Arctic regions. Owing to the fact that the peninsula is closer to Siberia than any other American territory, tension between the United States and the U.S.S.R. enhanced the military importance of Alaska. The armed forces intelligence services have told visitors to Alaska recently that the Soviet Union has constructed air bases in the Yakut Republic on Chukotski Peninsula, which is separated from Alaska only by the narrow Bering Strait, and has developed submarine bases—some of which were known to have existed before 1939—at Vladivostok, on the Kamchatka Peninsula and in the Komandorski Islands. American military strength in Alaska remains slight. The Air Force has been keeping but one fighter group and one bomber squadron in the territory. The Army stationed 7,000 troops there last winter, and General Omar Bradley, Army chief of staff, has told Congress that he

would like to raise the figure to 15,000. The bitter weather, the necessity for scattering limited forces throughout the world, and the difficulty of supplying armed services in Alaska explain the small size of the military establishment in that area.

President Truman in his special message asked Congress to remedy the transportation problem, which directly affects supplies. He said that Alaska "has had a territorial government for more than thirty-five years—surely a sufficient period of preparation for its admission as a state" (the present population is over 94,000). The territory is one-fifth the size of the continental United States, but the President pointed out that many small states have more miles of highway and railroads than Alaska. The roads are gravel over long stretches, and their satisfactory improvement calls for the substitution of hard surfaces. The Alaska Railroad, owned by the Federal government and operated by the Interior Department, needs rehabilitation, and a new petroleum pipe line to the interior of Alaska is desirable both for military development and civilian needs.

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXVII, No. 34, JUNE 4, 1948. Published weekly from September through May inclusive and biweekly during June, July and August by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated. National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. BROOKS EMENY, President; HELEN M. DAGGETT, Secretary; VERA MICHELES DEAN, Editor. Entered as second-class matter December 2, 1921, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Four Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.

F. P. A. Membership (which includes the Bulletin), Six Dollars a Year.

Produced under union conditions and composed and printed by union labor.



Lines of communication to Alaska as well as within Alaska also require development if the region is to become an effective military bastion. The availability for peacetime use of the Alaska Highway from Edmonton to Fairbanks and the operation of regularly scheduled passenger air transport flights by Northwest Airlines and Pan-American Airways have greatly facilitated Alaska's contact with the outside world as compared with the situation before World War II. But Alaska still depends primarily on maritime ships to bring in supplies, as it did in the gold-rush days. To assure reasonably good shipping service, President Truman advocated the extension for one year of the present government program subsidizing the operation of the three lines serving Alaska—the Alaska Steamship Company, the Northland Transportation Company, and the Alaska Transportation Company. On May 14 Edward L. Bartlett, delegate for Alaska in Congress, introduced a bill which points up a remaining shipping problem. He would authorize any company to apply for the subsidy in the hope that this would eliminate what now is in effect a monopoly on the trade held by the three present operators. The Administration has not supported this move.

### **Hawaii and Puerto Rico**

Not all American governmental institutions share the new attitude of the military establishment toward political activity in strategic areas. A vote in the Senate on May 20 eliminated the possibility that Hawaii will become a state during the present session of Congress. The Senate on May 20 refused, 51 to 20, to request the Public Lands Committee to bring the statehood bill to the floor. The arguments most vigorously pressed by the opposition were that the island population includes many Communists; that Harry Bridges, president of the CIO International Longshoremen and Warehousemen Union, dominates the Hawaiian political situation; that the islands are far from the United States and peopled with "many different nationalities." The House had approved statehood by 196 to 133 on June 30, 1947, and Senator Guy Cordon, Republican, of Oregon, chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Possessions, had recommended statehood after a recent visit to Hawaii.

The 80th Congress has also refused to put to a vote a bill introduced by Senator William Langer, Republican, of North

Dakota, to grant statehood to Puerto Rico. But with the signing of the Butler-Crawford Act on August 5, 1947, giving Puerto Ricans the right to elect their own governor, our Caribbean dependency obtained a larger degree of self-government than any other American territory. The House may still act this session on a bill allowing the insular legislature to fix the salaries of the governor, heads of departments and its own members. Statehood is only one of three arrangements seriously proposed for the island, the others being independence or local autonomy. Each of these proposals has considerable support in Puerto Rico, whose future status will be an important role in the first gubernatorial elections next November.

BLAIR BOLLES

### **Summer Activities of Research Staff**

Winifred N. Hadsel is spending two months in France and Austria on a first-hand study of political and economic conditions. The material gathered during her visit to Austria will be embodied in a *Foreign Policy Report* on postwar developments in that country to be published on October 1.

Vera M. Dean will give a course on American foreign policy at Mills College during the summer term, July 3-August 14. During her stay in the San Francisco area, Mrs. Dean will consult with members of the World Affairs Council of Northern California concerning co-operation between that group and the Foreign Policy Association.

### **Available Now**

Why are President Truman and the armed forces urging statehood for Alaska? What are the objectives of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Canada, and other nations in the Arctic? For background information on an area that is assuming growing importance in the strategy of the great powers, READ

#### **ARCTIC DIPLOMACY**

by Blair Bolles

June 1 issue of

FOREIGN POLICY REPORTS—25 cents  
Subscription \$5; to FPA members, \$4.

*A Russian Journal*, by John Steinbeck, with pictures by Robert Capa. New York, Viking, 1948. \$3.75

A perceptive observer of life in the raw and a brilliant photographer join in producing a graphic and lively account of their travels in Russia.

### **News in the Making**

In strife-torn Colombia, the Liberal party leadership has issued a statement accepting the offer of bipartisan government, but rejecting the Conservative party's proposal for an anti-Communist national front. "No responsible individual can accept the infantile criterion that the Communist hand is at work in every demand for social justice and every campaign for organization of the workers," the manifesto declares. Meanwhile the investigation of the Gaitán murder is reported to have implicated second-string members of the Conservative party. That party's leadership was reshuffled in its recent convention, and its president, publisher Laureano Gómez, has left the country. . . . Australia plans to co-ordinate its military defense in the future with Britain and New Zealand. Details of an *Anglo-Australian five-year plan* for defense of the Pacific were announced in Australia on April 29. High Commissioners for the United Kingdom and New Zealand in Australia will attend meetings of the Australian Council of Defense when matters affecting those parts of the Empire are to be discussed. . . . The plenary session of the *United Nations Economic Commission for Asia* was opened by Prime Minister Nehru of India on June 1 at Ootacamund (South India). The provisional agenda includes recommendations for the industrial development of the region and a report recommending the establishment of semipermanent machinery for the promotion of trade in Asia. . . . *The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*, which has loaned \$606,045,000 to ten countries, is now considering making loans to Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Iran, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, and Turkey. Applications for loans are pending also from Poland and Yugoslavia. . . . *Wong Wen-hao* has become China's new premier, succeeding Chang Chun, who declined to continue in the post. Like his predecessor, Wong is well regarded personally, but his office carries little power. General Ho Ying-chin, who also declined the premiership, has become Defense Minister. This is Ho's first cabinet post since he gave up the War Ministry in November 1944, following an upsurge of Chinese and American criticism concerning his military and political role.